

PEP Core Team

The PEP Core Team developed the plan. Its members included county human and social service directors and managers (including representatives from the three counties that were reviewed in the CFSR), tribal child welfare workers, DCFS and DHFS staff, members of Wisconsin's Child Welfare Training Partnerships, representation from the state courts (to ensure coordination with Wisconsin's Court Improvement Plan), University of Wisconsin System staff, child advocates, and private agency representatives.

Because Wisconsin has a state-supervised, county-administered child welfare system, successful PEP development could only be achieved through an inclusive, partnership approach. And because such a plan clearly required a lengthy process of values discussions, deliberation and consensus building, the PEP Core Team did not wait for the federal CFSR report in January 2004 to begin planning. Instead, it began its work in September 2003, guided by CFSR exit conference comments and its members' expertise and knowledge of the child welfare challenges in Wisconsin.

The Core Team also formed six subcommittees to focus additional analysis and expertise in the areas of foster care, case review, service array, quality assurance, training, and communication. Together, the Core Team and its subcommittees generated approximately 250 prospective strategies to respond to the challenges expected in the CFSR findings. It delegated a smaller "Drill Down Team" to sort, refine and develop those strategies. "Drilling" began in December 2003 and continued through March of 2004 until the final draft of the PEP was complete. Throughout the PEP process, Core Team members voluntarily contributed more than 4,000 hours to its development.

The Wisconsin Child Welfare Executive Steering Committee consisting of representatives from the legislature, courts, state agencies and other stakeholders of the child welfare program participated in the review of the PEP strategies. The Executive Steering Committee, which approved the state self-assessment for the CFSR, reviewed the strategies on February 11, 2004. The PEP matrix and quarterly progress reports will be reviewed by the Executive Steering Committee at future meetings. (See Appendix A for a list of the committee members.)

As the PEP process and strategies were developed, they were presented to child welfare professionals statewide and discussed in 15 regional meetings of service provider organizations, advisory committees, and advocacy groups. DCFS circulated the notes from those meetings and provided opportunities for individual comment directly to county and tribal child welfare agencies across the state.

PEP Core Committee Members

Rachelle Alioto	Director of Training	Milwaukee Training Partnership
Reggie Bicha	Director	Pierce County Human Services Dept.
Sally Biddick	CPS Program Manager	Rock County Human Services Dept.
Mike Bloedorn	Director	Washington County Social Services
Jennifer Borup	Director	Western Wisconsin Training Partnership
John Chrest	Director	Wood County Social Services
Pat Cork	Area Administrator	DHFS/Office of Strategic Finance
Rosemary Davis	Deputy Director	Outagamie County Health & Human Services
Mary Husby	Indian child welfare director	Menominee Indian Tribe of WI
Carol Corn	Indian child welfare staff	Menominee Indian Tribe of WI
Charity Eleson	Director	WI Council on Children and Families
Colleen Ellingson	Executive Director	Adoption Resources of Wisconsin
John Grace	Executive Director	WI Assoc. of Family & Children's Agencies
Harry Hobbs	Assistant Area Administrator	DHFS/Office of Strategic Finance
Gerald Huber	Director	La Crosse Co. Human Services
Bill Hunter	CPS Program Manager	Brown Co. Human Services
John Jansen	Director	Kenosha Co. Child and Family Services Division
Michelle Jensen Goodwin	Project Director	Director of State Courts Office
Fred Johnson	Supervisor	St. Croix County Health & Human Services
Richard Kammerud	Director	Polk County Human Services
Charmian Klyve	Director	Rock County Human Services
Bob Lee	CPS Program Manager	Dane County Human Services
Don Maurer	CPS Program Manager	Waukesha County Health & Human Services
Ami Orlin	CPS Program Manager	Dane County Human Services
Stephanie Reilly	Interim Director	NEW Partnership – UW Green Bay
Denise Revels Robinson	Director	Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare
Ron Rogers	Lead Social Work Supervisor	Kenosha County Human Services
Lu Rowley	Director	Waushara Co. Dept. of Social Services
Sue Saeger	Director	Southern CW Training Partnership
Chris Sieck	Training Manager	Southern CW Training Partnership
Kristen Shook Slack	Assistant Professor	UW School of Social Work
Diane Waller	Director	DHFS/Office of Strategic Finance

DCFS Staff on the Core Committee included: Kitty Kocol, Mark Campbell, John Tuohy, Bill Fiss, Dave Hergert, Cris Ros-Dukler, Connie Klick, Mark Mitchell, Dale Langer, Jill Chase, Mary Dibble, Amy Smith, Paula Brown, S. Kate Johnson, Sharon Lewandowski, Tammara LeMay, Michelle Rawlings, and Barb Berlin

PEP Systemic Factor Subcommittee Members

Information System Capacity (WISACWIS System and use of data)

John Tuohy	Beth Wydeven
Michelle Rawlings	Dan Wendt
Bill Fiss	Harry Hobbs
Amy Johnson	

Quality Assurance (State program standards and quality assurance activities)

Pat Cooper	Barb Berlin
Mark Campbell	Paula Brown
Kitty Kocol	Judy Herman
Pat Cork	John Tuohy

Communication Strategies (Sharing information and involving stakeholders)

Kitty Kocol	Diane Waller
Kenneth Munson	Jim Malone
Denise Revels Robinson	Mark Campbell

Case Review System (Written Case plans and regular permanency hearings.)

Michelle Jensen Goodwin	Mark Butterfield
Mark Mitchell	Theresa Bacchi
Therese Durkin	Sally Biddick
Todd Campbell	Ellen Cheney
Therese Durkin	Sheila Corbin
Pamela Eitland	Kris Goodwill
Rhonda Tousey	Laura Kuehn
Connie Klick	Fred Johnson
Mary Jo Keating	Julie Jensen
Bill Fiss	Honorable Christopher Foley
Kate Johnson	Marianne Genter
Honorable John Murphy	Jodi Timmerman

Service Array (Needs assessment and services to families and children.)

Connie Klick	Rhonda Tousey
Dan Naylor	Amy Smith
Ron Rogers	Julie Allison
Mary Dibble	Sandy Hoefert
Chatellah Brown	Carol Wright
Dan Naylor	Mark Mitchell
Sharon Lewandowski	Sue Sleezer

Staff and Provider Training (Training for local agency staff)

Amy Smith	Reggie Bicha
Chris Sieck	Bob Goetter
Stephanie Reilly	John Touhy
Mike Bloedorn	Rachelle Alioto
Don Gjestfeld	Jennifer Borup

Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment and Retention (Standards for licensing, criminal background checks, recruitment and foster and adoptive parent training)

Kate Johnson	Eliane Reis
Dale Langer	Erin Brophy
Sally Hanko-Dees	Renee Sutkay
Cathy Swessel	Kristin Lampke
Colleen Ellingson	Amy Orlin
Jill Chase	Nan Upright-Sexton
Tammara Lemay	Deena Williams
Patty Hammes	

TRIBAL CHILD WELFARE ISSUES

Priority Number 1: Identifying Children as Indian Children

Issue Statement

Too often, children are not being identified as Indian children, either at all or at some point later in the child welfare process than should occur. In some cases, if a child does not have an Indian name or does not “look Indian,” it is assumed that the child is not Indian. Child welfare practice should be altered so that all children are assumed to be Indian until it is determined that they are not.

Outcome Objective

By _____, active efforts shall be made, at the point of entry into the child welfare system and at appropriate subsequent points:

- to determine if a child or a member of the child’s family is Indian
- to determine what the tribal affiliation is, and
- to notify the appropriate tribe or tribes of the child’s involvement in the child welfare system.

This is required by the Indian Child Welfare Act and must be done so that tribes can make informed decisions regarding their desire to be involved, and at what level, with the case.

Action Steps

Action	By Whom	PEP Reference	Other Reference
Statewide tool or screen to assist in assuring appropriate questions are asked (check with Montana, NICWA, and Oregon).	Developed by DHFS in collaboration with tribes, counties, and the Court Improvement Program. Utilized by DHFS (adoption) and county staff, and child placing agencies.		
Directory of federally-recognized tribes in Wisconsin and tribal contacts for use by agencies with instructions and technical assistance. Also list BIA regional office for tribes outside of Wisconsin.	Developed by DHFS in collaboration with tribes. Utilized by same agencies as above.		
Specificity of ICWA requirements and sanctions for violations of requirements; draft legislation provided to tribes for comment and suggested revision.	Developed by DHFS in collaboration with tribes and counties.		
Develop a statewide form/template to be used to submit to tribes to determine if the child is covered under ICWA.	Developed by DHFS in collaboration with tribes and counties.		
Provide tribes with access to WiSACWIS.	DHFS in collaboration with tribes.		

TRIBAL CHILD WELFARE ISSUES

Priority Number 2: Training on ICWA, Tribal Codes/Ordinances, and Cultural Issues

Issue Statement

Staff and administrators of a variety of child welfare agencies and organizations do not have adequate knowledge of the intent and content of the ICWA that supports the implementation of the law in either legal or practice situations.

Staff of the Department, the DOC Division of Juvenile Services, counties, private agencies, and tribes, and legal staff (e.g., judges, Guardians ad Litem, District Attorneys/Corporation Counsel) require ongoing training related to the content of the Indian Child Welfare Act and implications for implementation in Wisconsin. All training should include an Indian co-trainer.

Outcome Objective

By _____, all training participants listed above will demonstrate an understanding of the philosophical and legal concerns around removal of Indian children from their homes, placing Indian children in out-of-home care, terminating parental rights, and placing Indian children for adoption, all recognizing that there are differences among tribes.

Action Steps

Action	By Whom	PEP Reference	Other Reference
Require training on the above curricula and require an 80% score in order to be certified as completing ICWA training. [Ref. s. 48.981(8)(d), Stats.] Include juvenile justice staff in this requirement. [Ref. Ch. DOC 399, Adm. Code]	DHFS and DOC requirement. Applicable to DHFS, DOC, county staff, and child placing agency staff. To be developed in collaboration with the Department of Corrections, tribes and counties.		
Develop training curricula related to the above.	Training Partnerships, DHFS, Counties, Tribes		
Incorporate ICWA into appropriate state statutes and administrative rules.	DHFS in conjunction with counties and tribes.		
The University of Wisconsin schools of social work and related programs should include a component on ICWA required for completion of the degree.	DHFS, DOC, UW, Vocational/Technical System, counties, tribes, Training Partnerships.		
Require that staff and management of counties obtain available training from tribes with which they predominantly work on the laws, customs, and culture of that tribe/those tribes.	Tribes, counties, and Training Partnerships.		
Incorporate into state licensing rules that licensed agencies must coordinate/may not impede* the cultural, religious, and spiritual beliefs of tribes. *For further discussion	DHFS, counties, and tribes		

TRIBAL CHILD WELFARE ISSUES

Priority Number 3: Adoptions

Issue Statement

Tribes are not always involved in cases involving Indian children and the decisions that affect the outcome of the case, including removal from the home, placement in out-of-home care, termination of parental rights, and adoption. As a result, Indian children may experience outcomes that are not in the best interest of either the child or the tribe or both.

Outcome Objective

By -----State DHFS and County Staff and Managers, Private Agency staff, and Legal Counsel must involve tribes in all planning, implementation, and evaluation related to removal from the home, placement in out-of-home care, termination of parental rights, and adoptions to enable Indian children to experience positive measurable outcomes in adoptive services.

This includes the legislative intent of the ICWA relative to paternity and determination of the best interests of the child as defined in the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978, and assessing the appropriateness of adoptive placements.

Action Steps

Action	By Whom	PEP Reference	Other Reference
Provide technical assistance on and strengthen laws and policies regarding efforts to determine paternity, including DNA testing.	DHFS in conjunction with counties and tribes.		
Require documented proof of the Indian heritage of potential adoptive families.	DHFS in conjunction with tribes and counties.		
DHFS will contract with tribes to administer all adoptions involving Indian children.	DHFS in conjunction with tribes.		
Adoption home studies and agreements should specifically state how the child's Indian heritage will be preserved.	DHFS, tribes and counties.		
Provide tribes with listing of DHFS contract agencies doing special needs adoptions.	DHFS		

TRIBAL CHILD WELFARE ISSUES

Priority Number 4: 161 Agreements

Issue Statement

161 agreements were created pursuant to 1983 Wisconsin Act 161 and were designed to identify the responsibilities of each agency in terms of the funding of placements of children ordered by tribal courts. Problems encountered by Tribes in using 161 Agreement have included:

1. Counties refusing to enter into a 161 Agreement
2. Counties entering into a 161 Agreement and not fully complying with the terms

Over the years, additional issues have been added to 161 Agreements, including identification of which agency will determine IV-E eligibility, which agency will develop and implement case plans, which agency will develop and review permanency plans, etc. In addition, it has been recommended that these agreements also include other child welfare related determinations (e.g., how CPS investigations will be handled) and the inclusion of juvenile justice cases.

In recent times, other issues have arisen, such as the implications of either party not signing the agreement and the lack of sanctions for not abiding by the agreement. In addition, there has been much discussion regarding whether the agreements should be between tribes and the state rather than tribes and counties.

Outcome Objective

By April 15, 2004, counties, in collaboration with DHFS, will consult with tribes to assess the effectiveness of the collaborative planning, implementation, and evaluation of 161 Agreements and implement any corrective action that may include continuance, modification, or elimination.

Action Steps

Action	By Whom	PEP Reference	Other Reference
Define the content of 161 Agreements.	DHFS, tribes and counties		
Consider establishing a direct state-tribal relationship for placement funding.	DHFS, tribes and counties		
Establish a grievance process and sanctions for non-compliance with 161 Agreements.	DHFS, tribes and counties		
Identify implications of either a county or a tribe not signing a 161 Agreement.	DHFS, tribes, counties, DOJ		
Include measurable outcomes in 161 Agreements that include timelines and commitment of funds for services.	DHFS, tribes and counties		
Include "full faith and credit" language for tribal-licensed foster homes in 161 Agreements and Ch. HFS 56, Adm. Code.	DHFS, tribes and counties		
Consider replacing 161 Agreements with Tribal/County or Tribal/State child welfare agreements that are more comprehensive	DHFS, tribes and counties		

TRIBAL CHILD WELFARE ISSUES

Priority Number 5: Foster Home Placements and Resources

Issue Statement

Currently, there is some disagreement regarding the authority of tribes under the Indian Child Welfare Act to license foster homes outside of the boundaries of reservations or public trust lands. Our statutes and administrative rules are silent on this issue. There should be official determination of whether this authority exists or does not exist and that determination should be formalized in either statute or administrative rule.

There have also been some concerns related to “**full faith and credit**” not being given by counties and adoption agencies to foster homes licensed by tribal agencies. To a certain extent, this is due to the fact that tribes may, but are not required to, use the Wisconsin foster home licensing administrative rule.

As well, there is disagreement among counties, and between some counties and DHFS, as to whether relatives may be licensed as foster parents at the discretion of that relative. There is no question that relatives do not need to be licensed to care for a child, but they must be licensed if they wish to receive a foster care payment rather than a Kinship Care payment.

Outcome Objective

By April 15, 2004, DHFS will consult with tribes to establish a State Statute or Administrative Rule recognizing “**full faith and credit**” of the tribal licensing process and foster placement costs “on or off/near” the reservation.

Action Steps

Action	By Whom	PEP Reference	Other Reference
Clarify state statutes regarding whether relatives may apply for and be granted a foster home license when a child has been placed with them by court order.	DHFS and counties		
Clarify the authority of tribes to license foster homes on reservation or public trust lands and determine whether this authority extends to homes off of the reservation or public trust lands.	DHFS		
Include “full faith and credit” language for tribal-licensed foster homes in 161 Agreements and Chs. HFS 56 and 38, Adm. Code.	DHFS, tribes, and counties		
Training for county and private agency staff on laws, rules, etc. related to licensure and “full faith and credit.”	DHFS, tribes		

TRIBAL CHILD WELFARE ISSUES

Priority Number 6: Title IV-E Funding for Tribes

Issue Statement

Tribes can not receive Title IV-E funds directly from the federal government. The federal government is developing a proposal under which a state can opt to receive Title IV-E funds as a block grant rather than an entitlement. Under that proposal, it is clear that the federal government would provide IV-E funds directly to tribes. In addition, other federal legislation has been introduced that would allow tribes to receive Title IV-E funds directly.

In addition, at least some Wisconsin tribes would prefer to have a Title IV-E funding relationship with the state rather than the county(ies) in which they are located.

Tribes in Wisconsin support the legislation proposed by Senator Baucus that allows tribes to contract directly with the federal government.

Outcome Objective

By February 15, 2005, enter into a collaborative agreement that allows tribes to contract directly with the State Of Wisconsin for Federal Fiscal Year 2006 Title IV-E funds that may include:

1. Maintenance Costs
2. Training Costs for Child Welfare Staff and Foster Parents,
3. Administrative Costs

Action Steps

Action	By Whom	PEP Reference	Other Reference
Research the implication for Tribes of federal regulations on the provision of Title IV-E funds directly to tribes by the federal government.	DHFS and Tribes		
Consider establishing a direct state-tribal relationship for Title IV-E funding.	DHFS, Tribes and Counties		

TRIBAL CHILD WELFARE ISSUES

Priority Number 7: Safety of Children in Their Own Homes and in Out-of-Home Care

Issue Statement

DHFS has, in recent years, developed policies and provided technical assistance and consultation to county agencies on the concepts involved with the safety of children, including in-home family-managed safety plans, in-home agency-managed safety plans, and out-of-home care. Similar efforts should be undertaken to assure that tribal child welfare agencies are aware of these safety concepts and practices.

Agencies providing services to Indian children must be aware of the higher standard of “active” efforts to prevent unwarranted removal of Indian children from their homes and the court-ordered plan for reunification of children with their families, including the appropriateness of reunification conditions. This concept must be considered when establishing, implementing, and evaluating both family-managed and agency-managed in-home safety plans and both prior to and after any placement of the child in court-ordered Kinship Care or other type of out-of-home care.

Outcome Objective

By July 1, 2004, Tribes and Counties will enter into collaborative planning, implementation, and evaluation of measurable services related to the safety plans for Indian children in their own homes, in court-ordered Kinship Care, and in out-of-home care.

Action Steps

Action	By Whom	PEP Reference	Other Reference
DHFS, counties, and tribes should confer on the development, implementation, and evaluation of all types of safety plans, including plans for reunification.	DHFS, counties, tribes, private consultants		
County agencies must provide the earliest possible notification to tribes when a referral on an Indian child is received, when a case is opened, and at other required steps in the case process.	Counties		
Tribal child welfare staff should attend safety training (including content and use of tools to determine safety) designed specifically for ICW staff.	DHFS, Tribes, Training Partnerships		

WISCONSIN CHILD WELFARE EXECUTIVE STEERING COMMITTEE:

<i>ORGANIZATION</i>	<i>INVITEE</i>	<i>DESIGNEE</i>
<i>Chairperson</i>	Kitty Kocol, DCFS Administrator	
<i>Governor's Office</i>	<i>To Be Identified (previously Policy Advisor)</i>	
<i>WI County Human Services Association</i>	Dave Titus, Dodge County HSD Director	
<i>Wisconsin Counties Association</i>	Craig Thompson, Legislative Director	
<i>WI Council on Children and Families</i>	Charity Elleson, Director	
<i>State Court Representatives</i>	Christopher Foley, Milwaukee Co. Circuit Court Kathleen Murphy, 8 th Judicial District Court Admin. Michelle Jensen-Goodwin, Court Improvement Coord.	
<i>Department of Corrections</i>	Sylvia Jackson, Deputy Administrator	
<i>Department of Public Instruction</i>	Nic Dibble, Student Services Program	
<i>WI Foster & Adoptive Parent's Association</i>	Anne Rankin, Past President Sherry Benson, President	
<i>WI Police Chief's Association</i>	Tom Hansen, Police Chief of Iola	
<i>WI County Sheriffs Association</i>	<i>To Be Identified (previously County Sheriff)</i>	
<i>WI State Bar, Children and the Law Section</i>	Joan Korb, Attorney at Law	
<i>Department of Justice</i>	<i>To Be Identified (previously Crime Victim Services)</i>	
<i>Corporation Council</i>	<i>To Be Identified (previously Waukesha County)</i>	
<i>District Attorney's Association</i>	Scott Horne, La Crosse County District Attorney	
<i>State Public Defender's Office</i>	Gina Pruski, Public Defender Training Coordinator	
<i>GLITC/Tribes</i>	Jeff Muse, Deputy Executive Director	
<i>DHFS/ Health Care Financing</i>	Angie Dombrowski, Bureau Director	
<i>DHFS/Public Health</i>	Susan Uttech, Program Manager	
<i>DHFS/Supportive Living</i>	Dan Naylor, Mental Health Program Consultant	
<i>DCommerce/Housing Program</i>	Judy Wilcox, Housing Program Manager	
<i>DWD/Workforce Solutions</i>	Bill Clingan, Administrator	
<i>UW-Madison School of Social Work</i>	Kristen Shook Slack, Assistant Professor	
<i>WI Coalition Against Domestic Violence</i>	Mary Lauby, Executive Director	
<i>WI Association of Family & Children's Agencies</i>	John Grace, President	
<i>ASFCME</i>	John Petrusek, BMCW Social Worker	
<i>Children's Trust Fund</i>	Mary Ann Snyder, Executive Director	
<i>DHFS Office of Strategic Finance</i>	Diane Waller, Area Administration Director	
<i>Legislators</i>	Senator Carol Roessler, Tryg Knutson for Senator. Jon Erpenbach, Jamie Kuhn for Representative Mark Miller Other Assembly Representative - <i>To Be Identified</i>	
<i>County Child Welfare Programs</i>	BMCW- Denise Revels Robinson Kenosha - John Jansen, Ron Rogers Outagamie - Mary Jo Keating, Michelle Weinberger-Burns Fond du Lac - Kim Mooney Brown - Bill Hunter	

DATA MEASUREMENT METHODS FOR PEP

State data reported to federal National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) and Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS) is used as part of the CFSR improvement planning process to establish performance baselines and to set improvement targets. Current challenges are faced by the state as the implementation to WiSACWIS from existing legacy systems has increased data entry complexity and has resulted in variations to the scope, quality, and completeness of data reported to these two federal systems. Concerns and plans related to baseline and improvement measurements are described below for each of the two major areas.

NCANDS

State does not currently provide child-specific information to NCANDS and instead submits a non-child specific survey of summary data. The state is currently in the process of developing a NCANDS file to meet the child and agency file NCANDS data requirements. Once all counties have implemented WiSACWIS, the state will submit child specific information consistent with NCANDS and this data will be used to compute the state's performance on the Safety Outcomes.

Based on results from the state's alternate safety data survey conducted for CY 2001 data, the State does not meet national standards for both the maltreatment recurrence and maltreatment in foster care performance outcomes. The current proposal is to use the same survey methodology to establish baseline data for FFY 2002 and 2003. It is recommended that the state begin using WiSACWIS for 2004 for use in the state's PEP. It is anticipated that for FFY 2005, all safety outcomes will be measured using the child-specific data submitted from WiSACWIS to meet NCANDS Child File reporting requirements.

AFCARS

Data submitted in the AFCARS Foster Care file for FFY 2003 included a significant number of errors for data elements used to calculate the Permanency Outcome measures. The primary concern related to data quality is the lack of removal dates in approximately 10% of these cases that had a discharge from foster care during the reporting period, particularly those cases which exited care to Adoption. An additional concern is the lack of adoption discharges when comparing the total number of adoptions reported as discharges from foster care in the Foster Care File versus the total number of adoption reported in the Adoption AFCARS File.

The current proposal is to use the FFY 2003 data profile as is, for baselines, with the exception of the data used to calculate the Time to Adoption permanency measure. For this measure, the state proposes to resubmit adoption data using the excel file generated from the AFCARS Adoption File that identifies all the finalized adoptions and their corresponding dates of removal for FFY 2003. In order to mitigate against future reporting concerns and to directly remedy those cases with incorrect or missing data related to AFCARS, the state will be examining ways to enhance the WiSACWIS application. These changes will be used to support appropriate correction of placement data errors and to enable placement history on open or newly opened cases where such history has not been converted into or documented in WiSACWIS to be added to an existing case.

Outcome-Specific Measurement Strategies

For the Safety Outcomes, baseline data will be based on calendar year (CY) 2002 and 2003 performance estimates. For the Permanency Outcomes, the state will rely on baseline data as submitted for federal fiscal years (FFY) 2002 and 2003 under the AFCARS Foster Care file. Data collected in CY 2003 and reported for FFY 2004 will be used by the state to verify and update baseline measures. It is anticipated that the state will begin monitoring performance with the start of the FFY 2005 reporting period. For both outcomes, quarterly performance measurement will be performed and will be based on state generated reports using WiSACWIS data.

The Division anticipates the following baseline and quarterly measurement methods (also summarized on the attached chart) to be used for the five outcomes where the state does not meet the national performance standard.

1. Maltreatment Recurrence

Baseline Data

The state will rely on a survey methodology developed with the assistance of the National Child Welfare Information Technology Resource Center and approved by the Children's Bureau to arrive at an estimate for the maltreatment recurrence rate. This methodology relies on both WiSACWIS data for implemented counties and manual CFS-40 data to derive a random case sample representative of the children who were subjects of substantiated maltreatment during a six-month period.

For the WiSACWIS portion of the sample, a report is used to determine each sample case that had a substantiated form of maltreatment in the six months prior to and the six months after the report indicated in the sample. For the CFS-40 portion of the sample, a survey is issued to counties whose cases are in the random sample. The survey is used by the county to document whether each case in its sample had a substantiated form of maltreatment in the six months prior to and the six months after the report indicated in the sample.

Quarterly Performance Data

The Division recommends using WiSACWIS as the sole source for measuring performance on the maltreatment recurrence standard. The Division has developed a standard report to calculate maltreatment recurrence that can be run on a quarterly basis.

The Division will begin submitting NCANDS Child and Agency File data beginning in FFY 2005. At this time, the Division will explore the use of the actual NCANDS submission as a basis for measuring ongoing performance.

Improvement Target- 6.1%.

The Wisconsin performance based on the 2001 data was close to the federal standard and is less than the sampling error amount. While updated baseline data is needed, Wisconsin will likely need to meet the federal performance standard as the improvement target.

2. *Maltreatment in Foster Care*

Baseline Data

The state will use case counts from its state Child Abuse and Neglect Data base of those children who were subjects of substantiated maltreatment where the maltreater relationship to the child was identified as a Foster Parent or a Group Care Facility Staff. This case count will be divided by a cumulative out-of-home caseload count subject to AFCARS reporting requirement for the same period to determine the estimated rate of maltreatment in foster care. This methodology is consistent with the approach used by the state to derive a CY 2001 estimate for the CFSR Data Profile.

Quarterly Performance Data

The Division recommends using WiSACWIS as the sole source for measuring performance on the maltreatment in foster care standard. The Division has developed a standard report to calculate maltreatment in out-of-home care rate that can be run on a quarterly basis.

The Division will begin submitting NCANDS Child and Agency File data beginning in FFY 2005. At this time, the Division will explore the use of the actual NCANDS submission in conjunction with the cumulative caseload as report to AFCARS as a basis for measuring ongoing performance.

Improvement Target- 0.57%

The Wisconsin performance based on the 2001 data was close to the federal standard and is less than the sampling error amount. While updated baseline data is needed, Wisconsin will likely need to meet the federal performance standard as the improvement target.

3. *Foster Care Re-entry*

Baseline Data

The state will use the results of the federal calculation of the Foster Care Re-entry rate based on the state's AFCARS Foster Care file submission.

Quarterly Performance Data

The Division recommends using WiSACWIS as the sole source for measuring performance on the foster care re-entry rate. The Division has developed a standard report to calculate the out-of-home care re-entry rate that can be run on a quarterly basis.

The Division has been submitting foster care data to AFCARS and will explore using the data from these submissions as a basis for measuring ongoing performance.

Improvement Percentage- Minimum 1.35%

Additional data will be submitted to establish a baseline for this performance standard. The improvement target will need to be at least 1.35%, which is the sampling error amount. The actual target will be determined through negotiations with the federal Administration for Children and Families. Reducing re-entry rates will present a challenge in counties outside of Milwaukee as the balance-of-state counties drive the statewide re-entry rate percentage.

The re-entry rate in Milwaukee County, based on Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare information, already meets the federal performance standard.

4. Time to Reunification

Baseline Data

The state will use the results of the federal calculation of the Time to Reunification rate based on the state's AFCARS Foster Care file submission.

Quarterly Performance Data

The Division recommends using WiSACWIS as the sole source for measuring performance on the timeliness to reunification. The Division has developed a standard report to calculate the time to reunification that can be run on a quarterly basis.

The Division has been submitting foster care data to AFCARS and will explore using the data from these submissions as a basis for measuring ongoing performance.

Improvement Percentage- Minimum 1.9%

Additional data will be submitted to establish a baseline for this performance standard. The improvement target will need to be at least 1.9%, which is the sampling error amount. The actual target will be determined through negotiations with the federal Administration for Children and Families.

5. Time to Adoption

Baseline Data

The state will resubmit data necessary to calculate the Time to Adoption baseline data for FFY 2002 and 2003. Required data will be included in an EXCEL file containing all state agency adoptions reported in the state's AFCARS Adoption File for those FFYs.

Quarterly Performance Data

The Division recommends using WiSACWIS as the sole source for measuring performance on the timeliness to adoption. The Division has developed a standard report to calculate the time to adoption that can be run on a quarterly basis.

The Division has been submitting foster care data to AFCARS and will explore using the data from these submissions as a basis for measuring ongoing performance.

Improvement Percentage- 2.42%

Additional data will be submitted to establish a baseline for this performance standard. The improvement target will need to be at least 2.42%, which is the sampling error amount. The actual target will be determined through negotiations with the federal Administration for Children and Families.

Measurement of Wisconsin's Performance for the National Standards				
Performance Standards	Annual Baseline Data		Quarterly Performance Measurement Data	
	2002	2003	2004	2005
<i>Outcome Improvement Data Reporting</i>				
<i>Safety Outcome 1 – Recurrence of Maltreatment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Safety Survey (WiSACWIS and CFS-40 Data) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Safety Survey (WiSACWIS and CFS-40 Data) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statewide Estimate based on WiSACWIS Maltreatment Recurrence Outcome Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State WiSACWIS Maltreatment Recurrence Outcome Report
<i>Safety Outcome 1 – Maltreatment in Foster Care</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State CAN Data (Foster Parent/Facility Staff Maltreaters) AFCARS Caseload 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State CAN Data (Foster Parent/Facility Staff Maltreaters) AFCARS Caseload 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State CAN Data (Foster Parent/Facility Staff Maltreaters) AFCARS Caseload 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State WiSACWIS Maltreatment in OHC Report
Permanency Outcome 1 – Re-entry to Care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal AFCARS Re-entry Rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal AFCARS Re-entry Rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Re-entry Reports (WiSACWIS and HSRS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State WiSACWIS Re-entry Report
<i>Permanency Outcome 1 – Timely Reunification</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal AFCARS Time to Reunification Rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal AFCARS Time to Reunification Rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Time to Reunification Report (WiSACWIS and HSRS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State WiSACWIS Time to Reunification Report
<i>Permanency Outcome 1 – Timely Adoption</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Adoption EXCEL Chart (Based on Adoption AFCARS State Agency Adoptions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Adoption EXCEL Chart (Based on Adoption AFCARS State Agency Adoptions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Adoption EXCEL Chart (Based on Adoption AFCARS State Agency Adoptions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State WiSACWIS Time to Adoption Report
Permanency Outcome 1 – Placement Stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AFCARS Placement Stability Rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AFCARS Placement Stability Rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AFCARS Placement Stability Rate State Placement Stability Reports (HSRS and WiSACWIS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AFCARS Time to Reunification Rate State WiSACWIS Placement Stability Report

NOTE: FFY 05 denotes when all NCANDS and AFCARS data is from WiSACWIS for federal and state-level reporting purposes; use of federal AFCARS File as data source for Quarterly Performance Measurements will also be explored.

Wisconsin Achievement of National Performance Standards				
Performance Standards	National Standard (Percent)	WI Data 2001 (Percent)	Sampling Error (Percent)	Minimum Improvement (Percent)
Safety Outcome 1 – Recurrence of Maltreatment Of all children who were victims of substantiated maltreatment report in the first 6 months of 2001, what percent were victims of another substantiated report within a 6-month period?	6.1 or less	6.9 *	0.90	6.1
Safety Outcome 1 – Maltreatment While in Care Of all children in out-of-home care in first 9 months of 2001, what percent experienced maltreatment by foster parents or facility staff members?	0.57 or less	0.61 *	0.1439	0.57
Permanency Outcome 1 – Re-entry to Care Of all children who entered out-of-home care in 2001, what percent were re-entering care within 12 months of a prior out-of-home care episode?	8.6 or less	25.5	1.35	T.B.D. **
Permanency Outcome 2 – Timely Reunification Of all children reunified from out-of-home care in 2001, what percent were reunified within 12 months of entry into out-of-home care?	76.2 or more	71.0	1.9	T.B.D. **
Permanency Outcome 3 – Timely Adoption Of all children adopted from out-of-home care in 2001, what percent were adopted within 24 months of their entry into out-of-home care?	32.0 or more	21.2 *	2.42	T.B.D. **
Permanency Outcome 4 – Placement Stability Of all children in out-of-home care during 2001 for less than 12 months, what percent experienced no more than 2 placement settings?	86.7 or more	93.8	Met Standard	N.A.

Note: * Estimate based on state data sources

** For the permanency items, the minimum improvement will be determined in negotiations with the federal government.



DIVISION OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

Jim Doyle
Governor

Helene Nelson
Secretary

State of Wisconsin

Department of Health and Family Services

1 WEST WILSON STREET
P O BOX 8916
MADISON WI 53708-8916

Telephone: 608-267-3905
FAX: 608-266-6836
dhfs.wisconsin.gov

**DIVISION OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES (DCFS)
CHILD WELFARE STATEWIDE PROGRAM ENHANCEMENT PLAN
(PEP) IMPLEMENTATION TEAM**

Mission: Sustain a collaborative partnership approach to child welfare practice and policy with counties, tribes, and other stakeholders by achieving performance outcomes established in Wisconsin's Program Enhancement Plan (PEP) and the strategies associated with the 5-Year Child Welfare Plan.

Roles and Responsibilities of the PEP Implementation Team:

- Guide planning and implementation of child welfare program strategies at the state and local level;
- Provide an opportunity for the input of staff, peers, consumers, community leaders and others in the planning and implementation process;
- Provide multi-disciplinary expertise and advice in identifying child welfare program, policy and practice issues and recommendations on how to address those issues; and
- Strengthen and advance the cross-systems response to improving the safety, permanence, and well-being of children.

PEP Executive Committee

The PEP Implementation Team will have an Executive Committee that will meet (primarily by conference call) between the PEP Implementation Team meetings to assist DCFS in creating long term goals and strategies for the PEP Implementation Team, including the development of the agendas for the quarterly meetings.

PEP Committees

The Division of Children and Family Services (DCFS) has established five (5) committees that will help shape policies, procedures, practices and services, in order to complete the 20 action steps in Wisconsin's PEP within the next two years and the long term goals in the 5-Year Child Welfare Plan. These committees will be comprised of professionals from the following backgrounds: child protection, mental health, domestic violence, foster parenting, adoption, health care, law enforcement, the courts, and alcohol and drug abuse. In addition, the committees will also have representation from the tribes, consumers and other stakeholders. Each committee will be staffed by DCFS and include membership from the Implementation Team. The Committees will be used by DCFS to coordinate work plans for action steps and communicate its progress on PEP and 5-year plan goals to the Implementation Team. The committees will also make recommendations to DCFS and the Implementation Team as issues arise that affect implementation. The following are the committees and their responsibilities:

- **Child Welfare Case Process**: Clarify and develop policies and guidelines for standards of practice related to Access/Intake, Initial Assessment, and Ongoing Services. In addition, this Committee will address issues related to domestic violence and other child welfare associated programs and system.
- **Out-of-Home Care**: Enhance policies, practices, and procedures related to out-of-home placement, Title IV-E, Permanency Planning, Independent Living, Kinship Care, and the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC).
- **Adoption Services**: Develop and update policies, practices, and procedures related to adoption casework, Adoption Search and adoption assistance payments.
- **Training**: Update and develop pre-service and continuing training curricula and identify strategies for increasing the frequency of and accessibility to training for child welfare agency staff, court professionals, foster parents, and other professionals.
- **Quality Assurance**: Design and begin the implementation of a case review model and identify the management and program information needs/reports of the counties and the tribes.

In addition to the five committees, DCFS will create project specific workgroups, such as the Foster Care and Adoptive Resource Center Workgroup, on an as needed basis to ensure all action steps in the PEP and 5-Year Plan are completed. When issues and action steps arise that involve tribal child welfare, the already existent Indian Child Welfare Group will be consulted for expertise and guidance.

Frequency of Meetings:

The PEP Implementation Team will meet in-person for a full day on a quarterly basis beginning in November 2004. All meetings will be held at the Pyle Center at the University of Wisconsin Madison. Each meeting will also be available for broadcast to those unable to attend in person. Interim telephone conference calls will occur as needed. The meetings will also be open to others to attend and participate as their schedules permit.